

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of the arguments presented in the response mailed May 22, 2006. Applicants have considered the Office Action, and provide the claim amendments and arguments presented herein in response. In the present response, claims 1, 9, and 18 are amended. Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 19 are canceled. Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-18 are pending.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Pfeiffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,738) in view of Jennings et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,136). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, it must be established that each Applicants note that independent claims 1 and 9 as presented require the inclusion of cable management arrangements located both at the front and rear faces of the modules and both within the interior of the housing. Applicants assert that this element is not taught or suggested by the combination of Pfeiffer et al. and Jennings et al.

Applicants note that Pfeiffer et al. does not disclose front and rear cable management arrangements within the interior of the panel chassis. With respect to interior cable management arrangements, Applicants note that Pfeiffer et al. does not disclose front or rear cable management arrangements within the interior of the panel; Pfeiffer et al. shows cable management on a front portion of a chassis side wall, which is not the interior of the chassis. *See* Pfeiffer et al., Figure 5. Pfeiffer et al. therefore does not teach incorporation of the cable management arrangement within the interior of the panel. With respect to a rear cable management arrangement, Applicants further note that Pfeiffer et al. shows connection of the modules to a rear power bus 204 which is located at the rear edge of that panel. *See* Pfeiffer et al., Figure 6. Applicants note that when the modules are installed, the panel lacks sufficient space for simply adding a rear cable management arrangement, because the modules use the entire depth from the front to the back of the panel. Addition of such an element within the panel would therefore require more than mere duplication as discussed in the Office Action.

Applicants conclude that there is no teaching or suggestion in Pfeiffer et al. to incorporate both front and rear cable management arrangements into the interior.

Applicants note that Jennings et al. also does not disclose either front or rear cable management arrangements within the interior of a panel. Jennings et al. discloses a front cable management arrangement within the interior of the panel. *See, e.g.*, Jennings et al., Figure 5. Jennings, however, discloses connection of fiber test modules into a backplane which resides within the entire rear portion of that panel. There is no need for rear cable management in the system of Jennings et al., because light signals are generated in the controller circuitry and all fiber output connections exist on the modules 24 facing the front side of the panel. *See* Jennings, et al., col. 2, lines 54-62 (Summary of Invention). Applicants therefore assert that there is no teaching or suggestion in Jennings et al. to incorporate front and rear cable management arrangements into the interior of a panel chassis.

For at least the above reason, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 9 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Pfeiffer et al. and Jennings et al. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of these claims. Claims 4-8 and 12-16 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and therefore inherit all of the limitations recited therein. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of these claims for at least the same reasons.

With respect to claims 17-18, Applicants note that independent claim 17 as presented requires opposed flanges on the front face of the modules for mounting the modules to a bulkhead within the interior of a panel chassis. Applicants note that in Pfeiffer et al., at least one of the opposing flanges on a front face of the module attaches to a side of the panel chassis and not to a bulkhead. *See* Pfeiffer et al. at Figure 5. Applicants respectfully observe that modification of Pfeiffer et al. to attach two opposed flanges to a bulkhead would require movement of either the bulkhead or a change in the shape/size of the modules, and note that Jennings et al. would not provide any reason to suggest such a change. Applicants therefore assert that claim 17 is not rendered obvious by the combination of these references.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully note that the combination of references does not teach or suggest at least this element, and respectfully request reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection of this claim. Applicants note that claim 18 depends from claim 17, and inherits all limitations therefrom. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of that claim as well.


**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Dec. 11, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven C. Bruess  
Reg. No. 34,130  
SBruess/AJL/dc